

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are herein cancelled and replaced with new claims 31-58.

Claims 1-30 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,480) in view of Schuster (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,622) in further view of Rupert (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915).

On September 5, 2006, the Examiner granted the Applicants' attorney the courtesy of a telephonic interview. During the interview, the Applicants noted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the use of compact availability data that includes concise generic indicators, as recited in each of claims 1-30. The Examiner noted that the claimed limitations of "compact" and "concise" were relative terms and unclear as no reference point was established. The Examiner then indicated that adding such a reference point would be viewed favorably. The Examiner further indicated that a Request for Continued Examination would be required.

Accordingly, the Applicants are herein filing a Request for Continued Examination, and have cancelled claims 1-30 and herein submit new claims 31-58. Each of the claims now recites: "... wherein the availability data set is compact relative to the calendar data in that it generically indicates a subset of information selected from the calendar data, the subset of information including at least one of free space in an attendee's schedule and busy space in an attendee's schedule ... ."

Conmy does not disclose or suggest a compact availability data set selected from

available calendar data. Rather, Conmy discloses that the availability information for a particular user includes both “profiles 202 and calendar files 210” (col. 4, lines 1-3). Thus, Conmy not only sends a full complement of calendar data, but also sends invitee profiles (e.g., “information regarding events that have already been scheduled for that invitee,” “information regarding each invitee’s work hours ... and non-work hours,” “time zone,” “physical location ... and the hours of that location”) (col. 3, lines 56-65).

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the cited art.

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and allow claims 31-58. The Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone, facsimile, or email for quickest resolution, if there are any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,  
LEO PARKER, et al.

Date: September 18, 2006

By: /Neil F. Maloney, Reg. No. 42,833/

Neil F. Maloney  
Registration No. 42,833  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7607  
Fax: (650) 938-5200